



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/536,053	03/27/2000	Michael K. Just	0500.9912151	5651
23418	7590	10/05/2007	EXAMINER	
VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ 222 N. LASALLE STREET CHICAGO, IL 60601			WYSZYNSKI, AUBREY H	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2134				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/05/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/536,053	JUST, MICHAEL K.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Aubrey H. Wyszynski	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7,9-15,17-26,28-35,37,38 and 40-48 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 1-7,9-15,17-26,28-35,37,40-44 and 46-48 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 38 and 45 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 March 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The response of 8/1/07 was received and considered.
1. Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-26, 28-35, 37-38 and 40-48 are pending.
2. Claims 8, 16, 27, 36 and 39 are canceled.
3. Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-26, 28-35, 37, 40-44 and 46-48 are allowed.
4. Claims 38 and 45 are rejected.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 8/1/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
6. The examiner has changed the rejection to refer to the method of claims 38 and 45 rather than an apparatus. Please see the rejection below for further clarification.
7. Applicant argues Cooper does not describe a trusted – such as digitally signed by a trusted authority – alias map. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Cooper discloses (page 9, first column, second and sixth paragraphs and column 10, first paragraph) these features (see the directory "display" and "mnemonic tag" in Cooper et al--). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Geist in view of Schmeidler by generating a trusted alias map relating to corresponding mnemonic aliases of Cooper and by displaying these aliases in place of the same URLs and sender email addresses. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to facilitate the identification of Geist's message sources in view of Schmeidler.

8. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., trusted, such as digitally signed by a trusted authority) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 38 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geist (6,757,827 B1) in view of Schmeidler et al. (6,763,370 B1) and further in view of Bisbee et al (6,367,013 B1) and further in view of Cooper et al (US 6,052,442 A).

As per claim 38,

Geist discloses the determination of a digital signature verification error (see abstract; see fig.2-3 and associated text; col. 2, lines 44-62) and the generation of a digital signature verification map (see co1.4, lines 45-67; co1.5-col.6, line 38; fig.1-3) but do not explicitly disclose association of the digital signature with corresponding public key

(generating digital signature using public key). However Schmeidler et al. (6,763,370 B1) disclose association of the digital signature with corresponding public key (generating digital signature using public key) see co1.26, lines 55-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Schmeidler's public key digital signature algorithm in Geist's method and storage medium's signature verification method steps and means in order to provide security to protect the value of the content and prevents unauthorized use and copying thereof (see Schmeidler co1.2, lines 21-23). Geist in view of Schmeidler et al do not disclose received message header identifier association with public key, digital signature entity and the mapping.

However Bisbee et al (6,367,013 B1) disclose header identifier association with public key, digital signature entity and the mapping (see fig.1a, 23A4a and 5a and associated texts). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Bisbee et al's digital signature chaining in Geist's method, and storage medium signature verification method steps and means in view of Schmeidler's public key digital signature algorithm in order to re-validate e-original object a current time stamp and digital signature and current authentication certificate.

Geist also discloses the storage, receipt, and digital signature verification map update of at least one acceptable message header identifier, which becomes a map entry (see as applied above). Chan et al additionally discloses the verification of a digital signature associated with received message information (see as applied above). Geist in view of

Schmeidler in view of Bisbee fails to expressly disclose the generation of a trusted alias map and the display of at least one subject alias. However, Cooper et al discloses these features (see the directory "display" and "mnemonic tag" in Cooper et al--Page 9, first column, second and sixth paragraphs and column 10, first paragraph). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Geist in view of Schmeidler by generating a trusted alias map relating to corresponding mnemonic aliases of Cooper and by displaying these aliases in place of the same URLs and sender email addresses.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to facilitate the identification of Geist's message sources in view of Schmeidler.

As per claim 45, the use of e-mail address that corresponds to an entity is well known in the art, therefore proper certificate of an entity association with an e-mail is also obvious. The claim also shows an intended use (A recitation directed to the manner in which a claimed method is intended to be used does not distinguish the claimed method from the prior art if prior art has the capability to do so perform (See MPEP 2114 and Ex Parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987)).

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 1-7, 9-15 17-26, 28-35, 37, 40-44 and 46-48 allowed.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aubrey H. Wyszynski whose telephone number is (571)272-8155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, and alternate Friday's.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on 5712723811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AHW



KAMBIZ ZAND
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER